



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of skill in manipulating consonants. This will be realized when we find: "Only so much is certain that Kengi = Sungir = Shumer = Girsu = Shirpurla." What will philologists think of this transformation? What can we not prove if such methods are allowable? On p. 239 we find a severe arraignment of Winckler's "most careless and illogical argument" regarding Dungi of Ur; the conclusions which both scholars reach are due in large part to the lack of the necessary data to prove their premises. The reproduction of Thureau-Dangin's treatment of the names of the months (in *RA.*, IV, 83, 84) is scarcely relevant to the theme.

The appendix, in which we find some facsimiles, transliterations, and translations of the inscriptions in the E. A. H. collection, is a welcome though small, contribution to cuneiform literature. It gives the book one feature of value to scholars familiar with the other material of this early period. Though largely in the nature of contract or record tablets, they give us historical data of value, both in the old and in the new Babylonian periods. Several of the former date from the reigns of Bur-Sin, Ur-Ba'u, and Dungi.

Radau has used prodigious industry and brought together a vast amount of material—all except the E. A. H. collection already published in other works—and has classified it according to the periods to which he would attribute it. The book has its value in that it is a kind of register of early Babylonian texts. Scholars will, of course, use their own judgment regarding his chronological scheme. One thing is apparent throughout the work, viz., that he, like other "Sumerian" adherents, is having increasing difficulty in explaining the very early presence and power of the Semites in Babylonia.

It is not surprising if among the hundreds of references there should be some errors. We have noted the following, in addition to those already named: p. 15, second line, *Déc.*, 31, 3, should be *RA.*, II, p. 82; ninth line from bottom, *RA.*, III, should be IV; p. 16, ninth line from bottom, 70 should be 71; p. 27, l. 14, *RA.*, IV, should be III; p. 28, l. 10, same error; p. 81, l. 4 from bottom, F³ should be F²; p. 91, l. 3 from bottom, 281 should be 288; p. 191, l. 11 from bottom, should read Cyl. B, etc. Then, "Clercq," "le Clercq," occurring scores of times, should always be "de Clercq;" and "De Sarzec" should be "de Sarzec;" while titles of books would always appear more conspicuous and in better form if they were printed in italics. The author's English sometimes suffers from lack of familiarity with our idioms.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

IRA M. PRICE.

BROCKELMANN'S HISTORY OF ARABIC LITERATURE.¹

This is not a history of Arabic literature, but it is an excellent contribution toward such a history. Dr. Brockelmann is a worthy successor of the lamented Wüstenfeld and has taken up his self-sacrificing labors

¹ GESCHICHTE DER ARABISCHEN LITTERATUR. Von Carl Brockelmann. I. Band. Weimar: Verlag von Emil Felber, 1898. xii+528 pp.

with youthful energy. Thus the nearest parallel to this book is probably Wüstenfeld's *Geschichtsschreiber*; the differences in plan are not essential. The attempts which are made here and there in the present work at a history of literature proper, consisting of general sketches of periods, and suggestions of influence, of development, and of tendency, are far too slight to merit much attention. They might well have been omitted, and have somewhat the appearance of purple scraps saved from the wreckage of the more ambitious work which the author had once planned. This applies above all to the few pages given to a characterization of the old poetry. What is said is true and good—always excepted the remark, on p. 15, that only a small part of that poetry expresses the subjective sensations of the poet, a most singular misjudgment of what "subjective" means—but this was not its place, as there was no opportunity to develop the subject adequately. Similarly, the little sketch of the origins of Šūfiism is most able and interesting, but it is also most irritating. Everything had to be put so shortly as to be one-sided. The *Karāmāt* of the Šūfis, for example, may resemble the wonders of the Indian Yōgis, but they resemble equally the wonders of European saints as rehearsed in such a thesaurus as the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine. The same may be said of all the other introductory paragraphs scattered through the book.

But, apart from this, all the criticism which can be brought forward is one of details; and that, from the nature of the case, may be endless. Every Arabist must have dozens, and again dozens, of suggestions for additions and corrections which he would like to make. I shall give later a few which seem to me worth mention.

The plan of the book is simple and excellent. The literary development is divided into periods as follows: Book I, Arabic literature proper from the earliest beginnings to the fall of the Umayyads: A. To the appearance of Muhammad; B. Muhammad and his time; C. The Umayyad period. Book II, Muslim literature in Arabic: A. The golden period under the 'Abbāsids, A. D. 750—*circa* 1000; B. The silver period to the destruction of Baghdād, A. D. 1258; C. Under the Mongols till the conquest of Egypt by the Ottoman Turks in 1517; D. To the present day. The volume which we now have extends to the destruction of Baghdād. In the first period by far the greatest stress lies upon poetry; each poet has a biographical and descriptive paragraph, followed by bibliographical notes indicating where further information on him and his works may be found. Only those are considered whose poems, in part at least, have come down to us; and the principal manuscripts are referred to where there is no European edition. This is the method throughout the whole "History," and these bibliographical clues form the real backbone of the book and justify its existence.

The second period deals with Muslim literature written in Arabic. The distinction made is to the point and clearly drawn; in time it may help us to an escape from the much muddle-headed current talk about an Arabian philosophy and an Arabian science in which the Arabs had

little or no part. Each section is divided into eighteen chapters, and some chapters have as many as ten subdivisions, in part of subject, but mostly geographical. It is unnecessary here to state these divisions in detail. The scheme is generally good; but the difficulty of telling under which division a particular author must be sought is so great that most copious indices will be a necessity. It was a characteristic of Arabic writers to claim all knowledge for their portion and to write *de omni scibili*; Dr. Brockelmann acknowledges the trouble that this has made for him. Thus, in one of the chapters on philosophy (pp. 453-69), philosophers proper (*falāsifa*), logicians, and scholastic theologians are hopelessly mixed together. Yet the distinction between *kalām* and *falsafa* is one to be rigidly held; *manṭiq* belonged to everyone.

I now come to some suggestions on points of detail. The treatment of the whole *Jafr* and *Jāmi'a* literature is very inadequate. I have found mere references to it on pp. 44, 220, note, and 464. In this connection the paper by Casanova on the *Ikhwān aṣ-ṣafā* in *J.A.* for January-February, 1898, called for notice. A relationship is there established between the *Ikhwān*, these pseudo-'Alid books, and the Assassins. See, further, my "Life of al-Ghazzali" in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XX, pp. 113 sq. On p. 75 a reference would have been in place to Torrey's paper on al-'Abbās b. al-Aḥnaf in the same journal, Vol. XVI, pp. 43 sqq. On p. 77 add to the editions of Abū Nuwās that printed at Cairo in 1898; it is edited by Iskandar Āsāf and Maḥmūd Wāṣif. Pp. 179 and 520, the *Risālat ash-Shāfi'ī*, printed at Cairo in 1312, is certainly the *Risāla fī usūl al-fiqh*. It is not an ordered treatise on that subject of the later kind, but is exactly such an account of methods of reconciling *Qur'ān*, *Sunna*, *Ijmā'*, and *Ijtihād*, and of the nature of *ʿIlm* and *Hujja*, that Goldziher's account in *Muh. St.*, Vol. II, p. 83, would lead us to expect. P. 113, l. 17, it would have been better to read "Tihāma's" for "der Tihāma;" the name in Arabic has no article. P. 195, the more correct form of the name is Mātariḍī. On p. 156 reference should have been made to the edition, printed at Hyderābād in four parts and more than 1,400 pages (A. H. 1309?), of adh-Dhahabī's *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*. On p. 197, at the head of the section on mysticism, the *Nafahāt* of Jāmi should have been cited and, at least, the *Risāla* of al-Qushayrī and the *Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* of ash-Sha'rānī. It may be worth noticing that the Cairo edition of the last appears to be incomplete; it springs from Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ar-Rāsibī, who died in 367, to 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilī (or al-Jilānī), who died in 561. On p. 199 the account of al-Hallāj is very inadequate, considering his historical and religious importance. It may be supplemented with the following references: Schreiner in *ZDMG.*, Vol. LII, pp. 468 sqq.; *Fihrist*, pp. 190 sqq.; al-Mas'ūdī in *Tanbih*, p. 387; al-Bērūnī in *Āthār*, p. 211; 'Arib, pp. 86 sqq. Under the rubrics astronomy, astrology, mathematics I find no mention of Māshā'allāh. He may not be of much interest to a German, but he has his place in English literature; for Chaucer's *Astrolabe* is really a translation, through Latin, of a book by him. He lived, according

to Casiri, Vol. I, pp. 434 *sq.*, under al-Manṣūr and al-Ma'mūn; see, further, the *Bodleian Catalogue*, index, *sub* Mashaal la *Fihrist*, p. 273; *ZDMG.*, Vol. LIII, pp. 434 *sqq.*, 600, and Vol. VIII, p. 380; *Biographie universelle*, *sub* Macha Allah; Wüstenfeld's *Übersetzungen arab. Werke ins Lat.*, pp. 34 *sq.* Another most interesting figure, who has a bare notice on p. 244, is Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī. That he died in 400 we do not know; we know that he was alive in that year. He is mixed up perplexingly with the *Ikhwān aṣ-ṣafā* and with Ṣūfiism of a pantheistic type. See Ibn Khall. (de Slane's translation), Vol. I, p. 50; Vol. III, p. 264; ḤKh. 3831; Wüstenfeld, *Geschichtsschr.*, p. 54; *Fihrist*, Vol. II, p. 121; Aḥmad Zakī, *Mawṣū'āt al-'ulūm* (Būlāq, 1308), pp. 12, 72 *sqq.*; *ZDMG.*, Vol. LII, p. 558; "Life of al-Ghazzālī," cited above, p. 113. Two of his *Risālas* were printed at Constantinople, A. H. 1301. The wording of p. 273, l. 4, suggests, what is of course absurd, that the question of God's *istiwā* was first propounded by al-Ghazzālī. P. 307, the 'Umda of Ibn Rashīq has been printed at Tunis. P. 350, the chapter of ath-Tha'labī's *Qīṣaṣ* containing the history of Job has been translated in this JOURNAL, Vol. XIV, pp. 145-61. P. 389, the *Waraqāt* of the Imām al-ḥaramayn was printed at Cairo in 1306, along with the *sharḥ* of al-Maḥallī and the super-commentary of Aḥmad b. Qāsim al-'Ubādī; Ibn Qāsim explains that his work is extracted from his larger commentary on the same two books. In the paragraph on Ibn Tūmart (pp. 400 *sqq.*) sufficient stress is not laid on the pantheistic *nuance* in his views. Nor are the materials for his life cited with sufficient detail; Ibn Athīr has a "Life" *sub anno* 514; see, too, the *Qarṭās*, pp. 110 and 116; Ibn Khald., *Proleg.*, Vol. I, p. 53, in de Slane's translation. On al-Ghazzālī (pp. 419-526) I would refer to my "Life" already alluded to; it is, I believe, much more full and trustworthy than that by Gosche, who had not access to the necessary sources, and who has frequently led Dr. Brockelmann astray. The biography in Ibn Khallikān is almost worthless. It may be said generally that Ibn Khallikān is of little value as a critical historian. His interests were not those of a student, but of a dilettante in literature. On the form of the *nisba* Ghazzālī I trust to be able to enter at length elsewhere. Here I will only say that as-Sam'ānī, though he knew the spelling with one *z*, did not approve of it, for he could find no trace of a village Ghazāla; see the Sayyid Murtaḍā's introduction to his commentary on the *Iḥyā*, Vol. I, p. 18. Further, the passage in Ibn Khallikān on which Dr. Brockelmann apparently relies is an addition in the autograph manuscript and has apparently been inserted in the wrong place. Next, the *Sirr al-'ālamayn* has been lithographed at Bombay, but, in its present form at least, cannot be by al-Ghazzālī. At the beginning al-Ghazzālī is made to say: "And the first who transcribed it [*the Sirr*] and read it with me in the Nizāmiya Madrasa secretly in the second period after my return from journeying was a man from the land of al-Maghrib who was called Muḥammad ibn Tūmarth (*sic*) of the people of Salamiya, and by means of it I perceived in him the signs of royal power." Next, the *Ta'rīf*

al-aḥyā of Ibn 'Aydārūs is printed on the margin of the Sayyid Murtaḍā's commentary (edition of Cairo, 1311), Vol. I, pp. 1-40, and the *Imlā* of al-Ghazzālī on pp. 41-252. The text of the *Imlā* is in great disorder. Finally, the book edited by Malter cannot possibly be by al-Ghazzālī; the contents and arrangement are enough. On Abū Ḥafs an-Nasafi (pp. 427 sq.) there is a paper with a translation of his '*Aqida* in this JOURNAL, Vol. XII, pp. 73 sqq., and Vol. XIII, pp. 140 sq. On p. 446, No. 112, *r. al-ghauth* is explained as though *Ghauth al-a'zam* were the name of a particular mystic; it is rather the title of a high official in the Ṣūfī hierarchy, like Quṭb. On p. 451 there is another curious mistake. On l. 18 *awliyā* is explained as "the friends of the Prophet;" it is, of course, the friends of God. On Ibn Sinā (pp. 452-8) we can now add Carra de Vaux's *Avicenne* and his curiously pessimistic or agnostic poem on the *nafs* in *JA.*, 9, Vol. XIV, pp. 157 sq. On p. 460 it would have been worth while to draw attention to the many translations of Ibn Ṭufayl's *Ḥay b. Yaqẓān*; it is one of the few Arabic books that have secured an absolutely independent footing in European literature. On Averroes (pp. 461 sq.) reference should have been made to Tzitze de Boer's *Wider-sprüche der Philosophie*, a very valuable contribution to our knowledge of a man who is an intellectual puzzle because he chose to be one. No. 15, on p. 462, *Kitāb falsafat al-qāḍī al-fāḍil* (so rightly), printed at Cairo in 1313, is simply a reprint of the tractates published by M. J. Müller in 1859. This is shown by the text, which contains Müller's conjectural emendations, even where they are unnecessary. Finally in the article on Idrīsī, the geographer, no notice is taken of the Roman edition of 1592, the Paris translation of 1619, Jaubert's translation of 1836, or the extracts by Dozy-de Goeje, Amari-Schiaparelli, and Gildemeister. The reference which Dr. Brockelmann makes to a Swedish pamphlet will help a comparatively small number of his readers.

It is obvious that such annotation as this might proceed indefinitely; but that possibility does not detract in the least from the value of the book. The subject is such that absolute completeness and accuracy are unattainable. We have here, it is true, no history in any exact sense, but we have a thesaurus, a *κειμήλιον ἐς ἀεί*, of Arabic literary biography and bibliography. Every Arabist must be grateful to Dr. Brockelmann for his self-denying and patient labors. I only regret that the space allotted to me has not permitted me to treat his book at greater length.

HARTFORD, CONN.

DUNCAN B. MACDONALD.

THE MOHAMMEDAN ORIENT.¹

These may be regarded as the first numbers of a kind of supplement to the *Orientalische Literatur-Zeitung*, which is to consist of notes and articles by Professor Hartmann dealing with the movements of

¹ DER ISLAMISCHE ORIENT. Berichte und Forschungen. Von Martin Hartmann. Heft I, II, III. Berlin: Wolf Feiser Verlag, 1889, 1900. 40 and 102 pp.